

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 11. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Figure 11.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The replacement sheet for Figure 11 is hereby submitted herewith for the Examiner's approval.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 112

The Examiner is thanked for thoroughly examining the present application. Claims have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC § 112.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6-7, 9-13, 14, 15-19, 20-21, 22-24, 39-43, and 47-65 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0027639 (*Peterson et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0003988 (*Walker et al.*), U.S. Patent No. 6,345,297 (Grimm et al.), and U.S. Patent No. 6,638,170 (*Crumby*). The Examiner's rejection of claims is fully traversed below.

It is noted that *Peterson et al.* teaches:

To begin game play, a connection between a game client and a server is formed such that the game client communicates with the server via the transmission mechanism. [Paragraph [0019] of *Peterson et al.*]

It is further noted that *Peterson et al.* teaches:

The library 18 located at each game client 14 receives data packets and collects data packets to be sent to server 12 by way of the transmission mechanism 26. The library 18 communicates with the client application 16 through an application program interface (API), where the API is responsible for transmitting information to and receiving information from the client application 16 and related library 18 and the server 12. The server 12 tracks, in the preferred embodiment, changes made to the data store 20 and subsequently updates each library 18 located at each game client 14 with any modifications to the proprietary software component of the client application 16. [Paragraph [0039] of *Peterson et al.*]

However, it is respectfully submitted that *Peterson et al.* does not teach or suggest receiving game data from a selected casino game server after selecting the casino game server from a plurality of game servers organized based on server information received prior to selecting the casino game server.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Peterson et al.* does not teach or suggest receiving game data for a game that is not available in the context of claimed invention recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and other independent claims are patentable over the cited art for one or more reasons stated above.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case obviousness because the Examiner has failed to provide a motivation or suggestion for combining *Peterson et al.* and *Walker et al.* For example, the Examiner has asserted that: “[i]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the value payout of Walker into the gaming device of Peterson in order to create a more exciting game for a player to play, by offering an award for winning” (Office Action, page 8). Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the general goal of creating a more exciting game for a player does not provide a specific motivation or suggestion in the references for combining the teaching of *Peterson et al.* and *Walker et al.*

Moreover, the teaching of *Peterson et al.* is in conflict with a client machine that determines a value payout as *Peterson et al.* clearly teaches that “[T]he server evaluates the performance of all participants and determine a skill level for each participant” (*Peterson et al.*, Abstract). As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Peterson et al.* cannot be combined with any of the other cited references in order to reject the invention recited in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P213). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/RMahboubian/
Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001